



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

MW

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/098,630	03/18/2002	Gunter Reichert	225/50993	3713
23911	7590	11/19/2003	EXAMINER	
CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			WIMER, MICHAEL C	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2821				

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/098,630	REICHERT, GUNTER
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C. Wimer	2821

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a)  This action is FINAL.                            2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4)  Claim(s) 2-9, 19-21 and 27-37 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 2-9, 19-21 and 27-37 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:
    1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
  - a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (5682168).

Regarding Claim 3, James et al. show in Fig. 1, a plurality of antennas mounted on a car and all operating on different frequencies and used for different functions. Some antennas are arranged in structural cut-outs (e.g., antenna 40 mounted in the a structural cut-out, window 38, in the vehicle skin). Figures 2 and 3 shows the basic invention disclosed by James et al. with an antenna 70 arranged in a cut-out defined as 92, comprising a joint (i.e., the left front roof support) at which individual components of the vehicle outer skin adjoin one another. There is no specific suggestion that the embodiment of Fig. 2 is to be used in an antenna arrangement such as that shown in Fig. 1. However, a skilled artisan would have found it obvious to employ the antenna of Fig. 2 in a multi-band arrangement, such as shown in Fig. 1.

3. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al as applied to Claims 3 above, and further in view of Dorrie et al (5177494).

Regarding Claims 7, no slot antenna is suggested by James et al. Thus, Dorrie et al are cited as evidence of obviousness and as resolving the level of ordinary skill in the antenna art and shows a slot antenna arrangement 12,13,13a and 14, where the slot antenna 12 may be directly formed within the door, as suggested at col. 2, lines 15-16. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ the slot antenna system of Dorrie et al. in the James et al. system, particularly since James et al. clearly suggest many antennas are used on a vehicle since so many frequency bands and functions therefor are available for use.

4. Claims 5 and 27-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dorrie et al (5177494) in view of James et al. (5682168).

Regarding Claims 5 and 27-37, Dorrie et al. show a plurality of antennas 12,13,14 and 13a, where one, 13a, is arranged in a structural cut-out (i.e., the windshield or window) and another 12, is formed by a slot in the vehicle skin (see Fig. 2 and col. 2, lines 15-16, where the slot is formed in the “paneling element” or door), and the slot is dimensioned to operate at a particular frequency (col. 1, lines 46-48). However, all of the slot antennas disclosed are said to be connected to a common feed point of the feeder/radio for diversity/omnidirectional coverage.

Thus, James et al are cited as evidence of obviousness and as resolving the level of ordinary skill in the antenna art, and show in Prior Art Fig. 1, a plurality of antennas (including use in AM, FM, GPS, radar distance measuring, mobile phone, satellite radio, etc.) disposed in various locations on a car, and illustrative of a method for making such car. It would have been obvious to the skilled

artisan to employ such an arrangement of antennas in the car of Dorrie et al for providing a diverse communication system.

5. Claims 2,4,9 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoskins (2129766) in view of James et al. (5682168).

Regarding Claims 9 and 19-21, Hoskins shows a “paneling element” and a “ventilation opening” 1 in Fig. 1, mounted on the vehicle skin (e.g., in Fig. 3) and arranged “in the paneling element”, itself. However, the Hoskins antenna is not taught to be part of “an antenna arrangement having a plurality of antennas for different functions and frequencies”. Thus, James et al. are cited as resolving the level of ordinary skill and as evidence of obviousness in the antenna art, and show in Prior Art Fig. 1, various antennas and locations therefor positioned relative to the vehicle. It would have been obvious to the skilled antenna artisan to employ the paneling element antenna, itself, within the radiator grille of the antenna arrangement/system taught by James et al. as another possible solution in diverse radio systems.

As to claim 19, a grille is also a decorative element.

6. Claims 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoskins in view of James et al. as applied to Claims 2 and 4 above, and further in view of Dorrie et al.

Regarding Claims 6 and 8, no slot antenna is suggested by Hoskins/James et al. Thus, Dorrie et al are cited as evidence of obviousness and as resolving the level of ordinary skill in the antenna art and shows a slot antenna arrangement

12,13,13a and 14, where the slot antenna 12 may be directly formed within the door, as suggested at col. 2, lines 15-16. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan to employ the slot antenna system of Dorrie et al. in the Hoskins/James et al. system, particularly since James et al. clearly suggest many antennas are used on a vehicle since so many frequency bands and functions therefor are available for use.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims of record have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Wimer whose telephone number is (703) 305-3555. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Don K. Wong can be reached on (703) 308-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Michael C. Wimer  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2821

MCW  
05 November 2003